

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 4, 5, and 22. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 4, 5, and 22, replace the original sheets including Figures 4, 5, and 22.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 26 are currently amended. By this amendment, no claims are cancelled and no new claims are added. Support for the foregoing amendment can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed and as amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The title of the invention stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the title according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant notes that Figure 22 illustrates an exemplary structure for a wireless communication apparatus which is recited in claims 19-30. This figure includes various processing units, such as transmission buffer 21, data packet generating block 22, data packet management block 23, etc., which correlate to the units recited in these claims. For example, the data packet generating block 22 correlates to the unit adding a subheader as recited in claim 19. However, there is not necessarily a direct one to one correspondence between each of the processing units and the recited units. Nonetheless, it is readily understood from the specification and drawings that the

processing units in Figure 22 are executing the methodology described in detail in the specification in relation to Figures 1-8. Therefore, applicant asserts that the drawings show each of the features specified in these claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Upon further review of the specification as requested by the Examiner, applicant has noted and corrected some minor errors in the drawings. Applicant's have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended the claim 1 so that it depends from claims 4 and 11. Likewise, claim 16 has been amended to depend from claims 19 and 26. In this way, meaning of the objected terms are defined in the independent claims in a manner which overcome the rejection. In addition, the first instance of the abbreviation "STA" has been enumerated in each independent claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, Figure 22 illustrates an exemplary structure for a wireless communication apparatus which is recited in claims 19-30. This figure includes various processing units, such as transmission buffer 21, data packet generating block 22, data

packet management block 23, etc., which correlate to the units recited in these claims. Each of these different processing units are described generally on pages 42-44 of the specification as originally filed. Moreover, the processing performed by each unit is described in detail in relation to Figures 1-8. Although there is not a one to one correspondence between each unit recited in the claims and the processing units illustrated in the figures, it is readily understood which of these units is performing each of the different functions. For example, the data packet generating block 22 correlates to the unit adding a subheader as recited in claim 19. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that claims 19-30 contains subject matter that is enabled by the specification in accordance with §112. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Odenwalder (WO 02/091767). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant conferred with the Examiner who conferred there was a typographical error and the Examiner intended to reject claims 1-3 and 16-18. These claims have been amended in a manner which renders this rejection moot.

Claims 1-3 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Odenwalder (United States Patent). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 16 have been amended in a manner which renders this rejection moot. Accordingly, application requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 22, 2008

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/dec